

### Interview Summary

Application No.

09/943,801

Applicant(s)

SHETH ET AL.

Examiner

Steven B. Theriault

Art Unit

2179

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Steven B. Theriault.(3) Doug Schelling.(2) Dinesh Sheth.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 December 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 8, 9, 16, 37 and 41.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kumar et al(20020007330), Khan et al(20020007330), Flesner et al. (20020007330).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant and attorney contacted the examiner to discuss the limitations of the independent claims. The applicant presented arguments stating that the process in the present application of creating a view page differentiates the present application from the prior art. The examiner provided input into the claims where in terms of a broad reasonable interpretation the claims read on the specified scope of the prior art. The applicant stated they felt that they could provide a new more inclusive set of claims in an RCE and proceed forward with prosecution, The examiner also provided input into the interpretation of a monitor as being a broad term that could be considered a content area on the display which encompasses a broad number of display objects. The examiner also stated that any submission with an RCE would be subject to further search and consideration by the examiner..